

*The Culture of Prison Management*

*Measurement of Risk Control Culture in the  
English and Japanese Prison Services using the  
Grid and Group Cultural Theory*

Submitted by **Ayako Nakamura**, to the University of Exeter as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Politics, September 2011.

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

.....



## *Abstract*

Comparative analysis is crucial to academic studies of public administration because it provides understanding of the nature of different types of public service institution: in particular, it helps to show what they do and don't have in common, what kinds of institution they are, and what kinds of problems they face. However, in order to effectively conduct comparative research of public service institutions it is important that some thought is given to how they can best be compared. Accordingly, it is argued in this study that the differences between public service institutions can be appropriately analysed by examining their respective risk control cultures.

This study makes use of the grid and group cultural theory, as developed by Mary Douglas, Aaron Wildavsky and Christopher Hood, to analyse the risk control cultures of the English and Japanese prison services in regard to two specific types of risk, namely suicide and violence. The results show that particular patterns of organizational behaviour within the English and Japanese prison services can be identified with their respective risk control cultures. More specifically, the English prison service tends to try to control risk by using formal rules and granting strong leadership roles to governors. By contrast, the Japanese prison service tends to use informal rules and group pressures to control risk. Furthermore, the peculiar organizational patterns of risk control within both organizations are often not recognised by their members. As a result, the strengths and weaknesses of organizations can be identified by analysing the patterns of risk control behaviour within them.

## *Acknowledgement*

Firstly, I would like to thank Prof. Oliver James for the invaluable advice, time, and unwavering support that he has invested in me and this study. My thanks also goes out to Prof. Takashi Nishio whom set me on the course, as an undergraduate and postgraduate at the International Christian University, which led me to the study of public administration. He also provided great help for conducting research in Japan for this study. Many other people have helped me over the course of this study. I thank Dr Clair Dunlop for her support as a second supervisor. She extended to me a teaching assistant in the Department of Politics at the University of Exeter as well. Special thanks goes to all professionals I had conducted interviews in both English and Japanese prison services. Prof. Andrew Coyle and Dr Shane Bryans provided me great support for conducting interviews with prison staff members in England. I would also like to thank the examiners of this study, Prof. Andrew Massy and Dr Martin Lodge, for their critique and suggestions. Huge thanks go to Dr Edward Mullins, for his constant support. He also helped to improve the quality of English in my study. Also, I must thank Jonathan Redhead for his all-time help and friendship. And finally I would like to thank my family in Japan for their all-time support, financial and otherwise, that they have given me over the course of researching and writing this study. They always encourage me to pursue my intellectual interest in my life. I express gratitude for all of those mentioned above.

# Table of Contents

<b>List of Figures</b> .....	11
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	12
<b>List of Abbreviations</b> .....	15
<b>List of Japanese Glossaries</b> .....	16
<b>Introduction</b> .....	17
<i>The rationale of this thesis</i> .....	17
<i>Theories and case studies</i> .....	18
<i>Overview of data sources</i> .....	18
<i>Research Questions</i> .....	20
<i>Structure and Chapter plan</i> .....	21
<b>Chapter 1</b>	
<b>Cultural Theories:</b>	
<b><i>Theoretical and Methodological Development of Cultural Analysis</i></b> .....	23
<b><i>1.1: Cultural theories and methods</i></b> .....	23
<i>1.1.1: Definition of culture</i> .....	23
<i>1.1.2: Analysis of national culture</i> .....	24
<i>1.1.3: National value and culture survey</i> .....	25
<i>1.1.4: The findings and issues raised by cultural analysis in previous research</i> .....	33
<b><i>1.2: Measuring organizational culture</i></b> .....	36
<i>1.2.1: Organizational theories: Structures of the organization and cultural analysis</i> .....	37
<i>1.2.2: Measurement theory in the social sciences</i> .....	38
<i>1.2.3: Culture and risk</i> .....	43
<b><i>1.3: Conclusion</i></b> .....	45

## **Chapter 2**

### ***The Grid and Group Cultural Theory as A Solution to Measure Culture*** .....46

#### ***2.1: Grid and group cultural theory for measuring organizational risk control culture*** .....47

2.1.1: *Overview of theory* ..... 47

2.1.2 *Methodological advantages of the g/g theory* .....49

2.1.3: *Criticisms and issues against the grid-group theory*..... 51

#### ***2.2: Previous studies using the grid-group theory to measure culture***·53

2.2.1: *Gross and Rayner: Coding grid and group variables and the EXACT model*  
..... 55

2.2.2: *Listorg by Mars* ..... 60

2.2.3: *Application of grid-group theory in public service analysis: Structural analysis of risk control using the four cultural types*  
..... 62

2.2.4 *Summary of previous methods and the direction of the method for this study*  
..... 64

#### ***2.3: Properties and scales of grid and group variables*** .....67

2.3.1: *Properties for grid*..... 67

2.3.2: *Properties for group* ..... 72

2.3.3: *Properties of the g/g variables in prison service risk control structures* .....77

#### ***2.4: Conclusion***.....80

## **Chapter 3 Methodology:**

### ***How can the Grid and Group Theory be used to Identify Prison Service Risk Control?***.....81

#### ***3.1: Setting the purpose of measuring culture and the levels of observation and risk*** .....81

3.1.1 *Political backgrounds of the English and Japanese prison services* ..... 81

3.1.2 *The functions and aims of measuring culture*..... 83

3.1.3: *Setting units for observing culture in the prison services* ..... 83

3.1.4 *Setting specific prison risks: suicide and violence* ..... 87

<b>3.2: Coding suicide and violence risk control with grid-group variables</b>	90
3.2.1: Risk control system: Grid1: formalization (Y1)	90
3.2.2: Risk control system: Group1: Compliance (X1)	92
3.2.3: Leadership: Grid 2: The roles of governors (Y2)	94
3.2.4 Leadership: Group 2: Autonomy in local risk control strategies (X2)	98
<b>3.3: Scoring and calculation of total risk control scores</b>	102
3.3.1: Risk control system scores: Formalization (Y1) and Compliance (X1) scores	
Formalization score (Y1)	103
3.3.2: Leadership of governors: Scores for the roles of governors (Y2) and autonomy (X2)	110
<b>3.4: Total category and institutional risk control scores: demonstrating the outcomes</b>	116
3.4.1 Demonstration technique 1: the table representing all scores for sub-codes	116
3.4.2: Demonstration technique 2: standardization of scores and radar charts	117
3.4.3: Demonstration technique 3: standardization, additions, and plotting the total risk control scores	123
<b>3.5: Conclusion</b>	126
<b>Chapter 4 Risk Control System1:</b>	
<b>Formalization of Suicide and Violence Control (Grid 1)</b>	128
<b>4.1: Order and discipline in prisons</b>	128
England	128
Japan	129
<b>4.2: Defining risk</b>	131
4.2.1: Suicide	131
4.2.2: Violence	132
<b>4.3: Use of punishment and reward</b>	134
4.3.1: Suicide	135
4.3.2: Violence	137
<b>4.4: Key national guidelines: standardization of risk control procedures</b>	140
4.4.1: Suicide	140

4.4.2 Violence .....	145
<b>4.5: Information recording and documentation systems</b> .....	149
4.5.1: Suicide .....	149
4.5.2: Violence .....	150
<b>4.6: Conclusion</b> .....	152

## **Chapter 5**

### **Risk Control Systems 2:**

<b>Compliance Level of Local Establishments (Group1)</b> .....	157
--	-----

<b>5.1: Order and discipline</b> .....	157
--	-----

England .....	158
---------------	-----

Japan .....	158
-------------	-----

<b>5.2: Ways of identifying risk</b> .....	160
--	-----

5.2.1: Suicide .....	160
----------------------	-----

5.2.2: Violence .....	164
-----------------------	-----

<b>5.3: Appropriate use of punishment and reward</b> .....	167
--	-----

5.3.1: Suicide .....	168
----------------------	-----

5.3.2: Violence .....	172
-----------------------	-----

<b>5.4: Implementation of key national guidelines in local establishments</b> .....	179
--	-----

5.4.1: Suicide .....	179
----------------------	-----

5.4.2: Violence .....	185
-----------------------	-----

<b>5.5: Accountability in information recording and documentation systems</b> .....	191
--	-----

5.5.1: Suicide .....	191
----------------------	-----

5.5.2: Violence .....	194
-----------------------	-----

<b>5.6: Conclusion</b> .....	197
------------------------------	-----

## **Chapter 6 Leadership 1:**

<b>Roles of Governors in Local Risk Control Strategies (Grid 2)</b> .....	202
---	-----

<b>6.1: Specialization of staff members</b> .....	202
---	-----

6.1.1: Suicide .....	202
6.1.2: Violence .....	205
<b>6.2: Promotion criteria for governors</b> .....	<b>206</b>
<i>England</i> .....	207
<i>Japan</i> .....	208
<b>6.3: Interpersonal roles</b> .....	<b>210</b>
6.3.1: Suicide .....	211
6.3.2: Violence .....	215
<b>6.4: Informational roles</b> .....	<b>218</b>
6.4.1: Suicide .....	218
6.4.2: Violence .....	222
<b>6.5: Decisional roles</b> .....	<b>225</b>
6.5.1: Suicide .....	225
6.5.2: Violence .....	229
<b>6.6: Conclusion</b> .....	<b>232</b>
<b>Chapter 7 Leadership2:</b>	
<b><i>Autonomy of Local Risk Control Strategies (Group2)</i></b> .....	<b>236</b>
<b>7.1: The proportion of insider and outsider governors</b> .....	<b>236</b>
<i>England</i> .....	236
<i>Japan</i> .....	238
<b>7.2: Participation of external performance assessment bodies</b> .....	<b>239</b>
7.2.1: Suicide .....	239
7.2.2: Violence .....	244
<b>7.3: The existence and influence of trade unions</b> .....	<b>247</b>
7.3.1: Suicide .....	247
7.3.2: Violence .....	249
<b>7.4: Internal performance competition and the main indicators thereof</b> .....	<b>250</b>
7.4.1: Suicide .....	250
7.4.2: Violence .....	252
<b>7.5: Diversity of key local strategies</b> .....	<b>253</b>
7.5.1: Suicide .....	254

7.5.2: Violence	257
<b>7.6: Conclusion</b>	260
<b>Chapter 8 Analysis</b>	
<b>How Can Prison Risk Control Culture Be Demonstrated Using the Grid and Group Theory?</b>	
	264
<b>8.1: Qualitative summary</b>	264
8.1.1: Risk control systems; formalization (Y1) and compliance (X1)	265
8.1.2: Leadership; the roles of governors (Y2) and autonomy (X2) in local establishments	268
<b>8.2: Quantitative summary 1; grid-group score table</b>	271
<b>8.3: Quantitative summary 2; standardized scores and radar charts</b>	273
<b>8.4: Quantitative summary 3; demonstration technique 3, the grid-group map</b>	278
8.4.1: Prison risk control system; formalization (Y1) and compliance (X1)	278
8.4.2: Leadership scores; the roles of governors (Y2) and autonomy (X2)	280
8.4.3: Total grid (Y) and group (X) scores for suicide and violence risk control	282
<b>8.5: Conclusion</b>	284
8.5.1: Evaluation of qualitative results	284
8.5.2: Evaluation of quantitative results	285
8.5.3: Overall contribution of this study	286
<b>Conclusion</b>	288
For further research	295
<b>Appendices</b>	299
<b>Bibliography</b>	305
Legal Sources	315

## *List of Figures*

Figure 1.1: Scales continuum adjusted by the log-model .....	29
Figure 1.2: Risk and control in relation to knowledge and consensus .....	44
Figure 2.1: Visual map of the <i>g/g</i> theory .....	48
Figure 2.2: Visual map of the <i>g/g</i> theory including types of control .....	48
Figure 2.3: Grid-group map .....	58
Figure 2.4: Results for the social units in the Lakemouth nuclear plant case .....	59
Figure 3.1: Units of observation for measuring grid and group levels .....	87
Figure 3.2: Sample <i>g/g</i> radar chart in which values between 1 and 10 are assigned to the 20 sub-codes.....	118
Figure 3.3: Cultural types according to the <i>g/g</i> scales for each sub-code.....	119
Figure 3.4: a model of the most <i>hierarchist</i> culture.....	121
Figure 3.5: a model of the most <i>individualist</i> culture.....	121
Figure 3.6: a model of the most egalitarian culture .....	122
Figure 3.7: a model of the most fatalist culture.....	122
Figure 3.8: The map for the risk control system and leadership scores .....	125
Figure 3.9: The map for plotting the total risk control scores .....	126
Figure 4.1: Flow chart of ACCT procedures for prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm .....	141
Figure.5.1: Trends in the use of defence tools .....	190
Figure 5.2 Trends of N of recorded adjudications and self-inflicted deaths .....	193
Figure 5.3: N of punishments issued for violence and reports of serious assault between 2002 and 2007 .....	196
Figure 8.1: Suicide control in HMPS .....	274
Figure 8.2: Suicide control in the Japanese prison service.....	274
Figure 8.3: Violence control in HMPS.....	275
Figure 8.4: Violence control in the Japanese prison service .....	275
Figure 8.5: Models of radar charts corresponding to the four cultural types .....	276
Figure 8.6: Scores for the suicide and violence control systems operated by the English and Japanese prison services .....	279

Figure 8.7: Leadership scores for suicide and violence control in the English and Japanese prison services .....	281
Figure 8.8: Total risk control scores for suicide and violence control in the English and Japanese prison services .....	283

### *List of Tables*

Table i.1: Breakdown of interviewees.....	19
Table i.2: Interviewees with experiences of working as prison officers .....	20
Table 1.1: Examples of appropriate statistics by levels of measurement .....	42
Table.2.1: Grid and group scores for each predicate of the social group units in the Lakemouth nuclear plant case.....	58
Table 2.2: Summary of properties for grid variables.....	70
Table 2.3: Summary of properties for group variables .....	76
Table 2.4: Four Aspects of risk control analysis.....	79
Table 3.1: Security and safety incidents in Japanese prisons .....	89
Table 3.2: HMPS safety incidents statistics .....	89
Table 3.3: Formality of prison service regulations .....	106
Table 3.4.: Grid-group scores for the English and Japanese prison services .....	117
Table 3.5: Standardized scores with loads for aspects and sub-codes.....	118
Table 3.6: Total scores for formalization (Y1) and compliance (X1).....	123
Table 3.7: Total scores for roles of governors (Y2) and autonomy (X2).....	124
Table 4.1: Summary of formality and grid scores for suicide and violence control in the English and Japanese Prison Services.....	155
Table 4.2: Formalization scores for suicide and violence control.....	155
Table 5.1: Case studies: ways of identifying risk and related issues in local establishments .....	162
Table 5.2: Case studies in which issues were raised about how risk is identified in local establishments .....	166
Table 5.3: National statistics: N of self-inflicted deaths and punishments issued against self-harm in the Japanese prison service between 2002 and 2008 .....	169
Table.5.4: Issues raised about the use of punishment in Japanese prisons.....	170

Table 5.5: Issues raised about the IEP system in PIVC reports in 2010.....	171
Table 5.6: Case Studies: issues raised about the operation of the IEP scheme in local establishments .....	175
Table 5.7: National statistics: N of assaults and punishments issued for violent behaviour between 2002 and 2008 in the Japanese prison service.....	177
Table 5.8: National statistics: N of assaults and punishments issued for violent behaviour between 2004 and 2008 in HMPS .....	177
Table 5.9: Case studies of the implementation of local suicide control strategies.....	182
Table 5.10: National statistics on the reported number of cases of segregation between 2006 and 2010 .....	184
Table 5.11: National statistics on the reported N of uses of protection cells .....	184
Table 5.12: National record of how often handcuffs and straitjackets were used to control the risks of suicide and self-harm between 2006 and 2010.....	184
Table 5.13: Case studies: issues raised about violence reduction strategies in local establishments .....	188
Table 5.14: Record of types of defence tools used between 2006 and 2010 .....	190
Table 5.15: Annual national prison statistics: N of adjudications and self-inflicted deaths .....	193
Table 5.16: Compliance (X1) levels of the English and Japanese prison services for suicide and violence control.....	200
Table 5.17: Raw and standardized scores for the English and Japanese prison services in response to suicide and violence control .....	201
Table 6.1: Breakdown of HMPS staff according to job title.....	203
Table 6.2: Breakdown of Japanese prison staff .....	204
Table 6.3: Career development sample in the Japanese prison service: the case of a prison officer who joined the service at 18 years old .....	209
Table 6.4: Summary of leadership roles of governors based on Mintzberg's definitions of leaders .....	231
Table 6.5: Roles of governors (Y2) ranks and grid scores for all sub-codes .....	234
Table 6.6: Raw and standardized specialization scores for governors.....	234
Table 7.1: Time spent by governors in years in HMPS before gaining their first promotions to governorships .....	237
Table 7.2: The percentages of governors who gained their positions through conventional and fast-tack entry schemes .....	238

Table 7.3: Paths of entry into the Japanese prison service in 2003 .....	239
Table 7.4: Awareness of IMBs among prisoners according to HMIP full inspections .....	245
Table 7.5: Summary of autonomy in suicide and violence control strategies and group scores .....	262
Table 7.6: Summary of raw and standardized autonomy scores .....	263
Table 8.1: Scores assigned to the 20 sub-codes for each g/g aspect .....	272
Table 8.2: Standardized scores assigned to the 20 sub-codes for each g/g aspect ....	273

## *List of Abbreviations*

ACCT	Assessment Care in Custody Team in HMPS (England)
AIJ	Amnesty International Japan
C.B.	Correctional Bureau (Japan)
CARC	Correctional Administration Reform Committee in 2003 (Japan)
CSRA	Cell-Sharing Risk Assessment in HMPS (England)
CPR	Centre of Prisoners' Right (Japan)
G/G	Grid and Group
HMCIP	Her Majesty's Chief Inspectorate of Prisons (The official author of the HM Prison Inspectorate Reports)
HMIP	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
HMP	HM Prison (s)
HMPS	Her Majesty's Prison Service
IEP	Incentives and Earned Privileges
IMB	Independent Monitoring Board
IRS	Incident Record Systems in HMPS
JMOJ	Ministry of Justice (Japan)
MOJ	Ministry of Justice (England)
NOMS	National Offenders Management Service (England)
NPA	National Police Agency (Japan)
PIAG	Performance, Information & Analysis Group (England).
PIVC	Prison Institutions Visiting Committees (Japan)
POA	Prison Officers Association (England)
PPO	Prison and Probation Ombudsman (England)
PSI	Prison Service Instructions (England)
PSO	Prison Service Orders (England)
SCT	Safer Custody Team (England)
SIRs	Security Information Reports in HMPS (England)
SPC	Suicide Prevention Co-ordinators (England)
VRC	Violence Reduction Co-ordinators (England)

## *List of Japanese Glossaries*

*Jinj-iin* [人事院]:

National Personnel Authority

*Kunrei* [訓令]:

Regulatory codes in the Japanese Prison Service, which are equivalent to Ministerial Ordinance

*Joshiki* [常識]:

Common sense in Japanese. It was used to explain the risk control procedures by Japanese prison service staff whom I conducted interviews.

*Seiza* [正座] position:

Sitting upright on the floor with their legs folded back under themselves

*Tanto* [担当] system:

The traditional system for controlling prisoners by small groups in Japanese prisons.

*The Penal Institutions Act*:

The ellipsis of *The Act of the Penal Institutions and the Treatment of Sentenced Inmates* issued in the Japanese prison service. The act was issued in 2005, as a result of the CARC 2003.

*Tsutatsu* [通達] or *Imei-Tsutatsu* [依命通達]:

Regulatory codes in the Japanese Prison Service, which are equivalent to Ministerial Instructions